## Cumulative Table of Cases Connecticut Appellate Reports Volume 202

Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court abused its discretion in dismissing successive petition for writ of habeas corpus for failure to show good cause pursuant to statute (§ 52-470) for unreasonable delay in filing petition; whether habeas court improperly concluded that petitioner failed to sufficiently establish good cause for delay in filing successive petition; whether lack of personal knowledge of statutory deadline set forth in § 52-470 and lack of access to law library or legal resources sufficiently rebutted presumption of unreasonable delay; whether habeas court properly weighed relevant factors in dismissing successive petition.
to statute (§ 52-470) for unreasonable delay in filing petition; whether habeas court improperly concluded that petitioner failed to sufficiently establish good cause for delay in filing successive petition; whether lack of personal knowledge of statutory deadline set forth in § 52-470 and lack of access to law library or legal resources sufficiently rebutted presumption of unreasonable delay; whether
to statute (§ 52-470) for unreasonable delay in filing petition; whether habeas court improperly concluded that petitioner failed to sufficiently establish good cause for delay in filing successive petition; whether lack of personal knowledge of statutory deadline set forth in § 52-470 and lack of access to law library or legal resources sufficiently rebutted presumption of unreasonable delay; whether
court improperly concluded that petitioner failed to sufficiently establish good cause for delay in filing successive petition; whether lack of personal knowledge of statutory deadline set forth in § 52-470 and lack of access to law library or legal resources sufficiently rebutted presumption of unreasonable delay; whether
cause for delay in filing successive petition; whether lack of personal knowledge of statutory deadline set forth in § 52-470 and lack of access to law library or legal resources sufficiently rebutted presumption of unreasonable delay; whether
legal resources sufficiently rebutted presumption of unreasonable delay; whether
legal resources sufficiently rebutted presumption of unreasonable delay; whether
Newtown v. Ostrosky
Foreclosure; whether trial court properly denied motion to reargue and for reconsider-
ation of judgment of foreclosure by sale; claim that foreclosure judgment should
be opened and vacated; claim that default for failure to plead entered by court
clerk was invalid and could not serve as basis for foreclosure judgment; adoption
of trial court's memorandum of decision as statement of facts and applicable law.
State v. Ervin B
Threatening in second degree; claim that evidence was insufficient to support finding
that defendant made physical threat against his wife for purposes of conviction
of threatening in second degree in violation of statute ( $\S$ 53a-62 (a) (1)).